DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 813 EA 017 321

AUTHOR Hord, Shirley M.; Hall, Gene E.
TITLE Three Images: What Principals Do in Curriculum Implementation.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO R&DCTE-R-3181
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 37p.; For related documents, see EA 017 309-311 and EA 017 320-324.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Principals; *Program Implementation; School Supervision; Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Principal Teacher Interaction Study

ABSTRACT

Past research has correlated differential curriculum implementation outcomes at the classroom level with the actions of the key change facilitator at the school level: the principal. Accordingly, this paper reports the results of a study of three change facilitator styles among principals: responders, managers, and initiators. Working definitions of these three styles are reviewed; the methodology and sample selection of principals for the study are briefly described; and two schemata for collecting and analyzing principals' actions are presented: a taxonomy of interventions (policy, game plan, game plan component, strategy, tactic, and incident) and an anatomy of interventions (sublevels, sources, targets, functions, medium flow, and location). An unexpected finding about the importance of a "second change facilitator" is reported, followed by a presentation of three "images" of principals in implementation: one responder, one manager, and one initiator. Finally, the significance of the three styles in terms of implementation success at the teacher and classroom level is discussed. References are included. (TE)

THREE IMAGES:

WHAT PRINCIPALS DO IN CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Shirley M. Hord
Gene E. Hall

R&D Report 3181

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

1983

THREE IMAGES: WHAT PRINCIPALS DO IN CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Shirley M. Hord
Gene E. Hall

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

The response to the launch of Sputnik in the early sixties was a proliferation of curriculum development activities. Educators believed that innovative curriculum packages, which were carefully designed, would contribute to the much needed pursuit of excellence for schooling, and would result in increased learning outcomes for students. After some years of intensive curriculum development and delivery of new programs to schools, evaluation studies were conducted. It was conceded that something was amiss. The curriculum development efforts had not produced the desired results with the expected consistency. Evaluation reports, in fact, regularly stated that no significant differences were found between the old and the new programs.

That something that was absent, practitioners, scholars and theorists hypothesized, was the knowledge and expertise required to implement new programs, and to assist teachers in changing their practice at the classroom level in the way envisioned by the architects of the new curricula.

Change researchers at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE), The University of Texas at Austin, explored this problem.

The research described herein was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education. No endorsement by the National Institution of Education should be inferred.

Their early studies focused on teachers as users of new product and process innovations. These studies contributed new knowledge and concepts as well as new tools and measures that can be used for planning and assessing implementation from the teachers point of view. That teachers move through Stages of Concern about the Innovation (Hall & Rutherford, 1976) and Levels of Use of the Innovation (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford & Newlove, 1975) when involved in implementation was verified. A conceptual framework and tool for analyzing the different Innovation Configurations (Hall & Loucks, 1981) that teachers use was also developed and researched. This approach to understanding the change or improvement process placed heavy emphasis on considering two issues: how teachers experience a change personally, and what the new practice, or innovation, is in its operational form at the classroom level.

A major hypothesis that emerged from these studies was that the differential implementation outcomes that had been witnessed at the classroom level could be attributed in part to the actions and lack of actions of a key change facilitator at the school level, the principal (Hall, Hord, & Griffin, 1980). As a consequence, the most recent studies of the R&DCTE researchers have focused on the principal's role in facilitating change.

Other researchers and theorists have been studying and writing about the principal's role in educational change (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Leithwood, et al., 1978; Reinhard, et al., 1980; Fullan, 1982). Some studies addressed the principal as instructional leader (Cotton and Savard, 1980; Fege, 1980; Lipham, 1981; Persell and Cookson, 1982; Corbett, 1982). Other studies investigated the principal's role in school improvement (Rutter, et al., 1979; Venezky and Winfield, 1979; Little, 1981; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982). However, what principals do on a daily basis in their schools to bring about change and improvement had not been clearly revealed. Many of the studies

were normative in design and only offered broad generalizations about what the typical principal did. Assuming that there is variation in what principals do and that their role is key, then identifying the significant things that they do that relate to implementation of improved practice by teachers is critical.

In this paper the results of a study that specifically focused on what different principals did during curriculum implementation that made a difference are reported. The working definitions and descriptions of three principal change facilitator styles that were studied are reviewed. The methodology and sample selection of the principals for the study are briefly described and two schemata for collecting and analyzing principals' actions are presented. Then, an unexpected finding about the importance of a "second change facilitator" is reported. After this, three "images" of principals in implementation are drawn, followed by a brief statement of the significance of the three styles in terms of implementation success at the teacher and classroom level.

A Study of Principals

Having developed some useful diagnostic procedures for assessing and describing implementation at the classroom level in early studies, the R&DCTE researchers shifted attention to the prescriptive domain and to the study of change facilitators and the interventions* they utilize to affect curriculum implementation. The Principal Teacher Interaction Study (PTI) is the most recent of these studies. In the PTI study the role and daily behaviors of principals engaged in the management and facilitation of school change were investigated.

---

*An intervention is an action or event or a set of actions or events that influences use of an innovation--a process or product that is new to a potential user is considered an innovation (Hall, Zigarmi & Hord, 1979; Hall & Hord, 1982).

Change Facilitator Style

R&DCTE researchers have been pursuing the concept of facilitator style as an additional construct to increase understanding of the actions and effects of implementation efforts. Three descriptions of particular change facilitator styles were derived as a summation of results from several early studies. The earliest source was the secondary analysis of data from a study of the implementation of a science curriculum in one large school district (Hall, Hord and Griffin, 1980). A second study was a three-month pilot study involving ten elementary schools in different communities, each implementing different curriculum innovations (Rutherford, 1981; Hord, 1981). The PTI study followed these and the three change facilitator descriptions as refined in the PTI Study are:

> Responders place heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They believe their primary role is to maintain a smooth running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content and treating students well. Teachers are viewed as strong professionals who are able to carry out their instructional role with little guidance. Responders emphasize the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others. Before they make decisions they often give everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh their feelings or to allow others to make the decision. A related characteristic is the tendency toward making decisions in terms of immediate circumstances rather than in terms of longer range instructional or school goals. This seems to be due in part to their desire to please others and in part to their limited vision of how their school and staff should change in the future.
>
> Managers represent a broader range of behaviors. They demonstrate both responsive behaviors in answer to situations or people and they also initiate actions in support of the change effort. The variations in their behavior seem to be linked to their rapport with teachers and central office staff as well as how well they understand and buy into a particular change effort. Managers work without fanfare to provide basic support to facilitate teachers' use of the innovation. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teacher needs. They will defend their teachers from what are perceived as excessive demands. When they learn that the central office wants something to happen in their school they then become very involved with their teachers in making it happen. Yet, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the basics of what is imposed.

> Initiators have clear, decisive long-range policies and goals that transcend but include implementation of the current innovation. They tend to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be like and work intensely to attain this vision. Decisions are made in relation to their goals for the school and in terms of what they believe to be best for students which is based on current knowledge of classroom practice. Initiators have strong expectations for students, teachers and themselves. They convey and monitor these expectations through frequent contacts with teachers and clear explication of how the school is to operate and how teachers are to teach. When they feel it is in the best interest of their school, particularly the students, Initiators will seek changes in district programs or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school. Initiators will be adamant but not unkind. They solicit input from staff and then decisions are made in terms of the goal of the school even if some are ruffled by their directness and high expectations (Hall & Rutherford, 1983, p. 84).

These three styles do not represent the entire spectrum of possible styles. However, they do represent three quite different ways that principals can approach their facilitator role.

An important component of the PTI study was an extensive examination of the literature on leadership, change and education administrators. Based on the literature review and on the synthesis of the findings from the PTI study, the R&DCTE researchers proposed a definition of style as "the gestalt of knowledge, concerns, behaviors and tone as reflected in the motivations and interventions of the facilitator," (Rutherford, Hord, Huling and Hall, 1983, p. 119). Once the working definition and descriptions had been established, each of these styles could be addressed.

Methodology

The focus of the PTI study was on identifying and describing the innovation-related interventions that occurred during curriculum implementation in nine elementary schools. Three major questions guided this study: (1) What do principals do as change facilitators? (2) How do the concerns of principals affect their functioning as change facilitators? and (3) What is the relationship between administrator concerns, the interventions they make

and their effects on teachers? In the study, the interventions that were made by school-based administrators and teachers, as well as by district and system-level personnel, were documented as they occurred across an entire school year.

Principals were trained on an individual basis to identify and describe interventions made by themselves and others. In these sessions, principals were taught to provide sufficient information in reporting interventions to allow the research staff to code the interventions on various dimensions (Hord, Hall & Zigarmi, 1980). The in-depth documentation procedures included logs maintained by the principals and assistant principals (in schools where there was an assistant), on-site observations, face-to-face interviews and weekly telephone interviews that were conducted by the research staff (Goldstein & Rutherford, 1982). Data about interventions were collected also from teachers as a cross-informant verification strategy and in an attempt to assess the effectiveness of selected interventions.

As a means to assess implementation of the new curricula at the classroom level, implementation data were collected about teachers' Stages of Concern, Level of Use and the Innovation Configuration that each was using. As already mentioned, these three concepts and measures have been used in numerous studies to assess change efforts and to understand how a school improvement effort is progressing. The teacher data collection activities included paper/pencil instruments administered four times over the period of the one year study and on-site interviews by the research staff with individual teachers at three points (Huling, Hall, Hord, Rutherford, 1983).

Sample Selection

Three Pacific schools were in their first year of implementing a new writing composition program; three Atlantic schools were beginning the second

year of implementation of a criterion-referenced math curriculum; three schools in the Central Mountain district were in the third year of use of a revised science curriculum. Three principals were selected from each of the three districts to serve as the primary subjects and informants in the study. The principals were chosen by district administrators as representative of three approaches to facilitating implementation. The selections were made based on the three hypothesized change facilitator styles (Hall, Rutherford & Griffin, 1982) and the rudimentary descriptions of the styles that had been developed at that time.

Two Frameworks for Studying the Interventions of Principals

Two analytical frameworks, the Taxonomy of Interventions (Hall & Hord, 1982) and the Anatomy of Interventions (Hord, Hall, & Zigarmi, 1980) were used to focus the documentation of interventions and subsequently to analyze the intervention data. These two frameworks are briefly reviewed.

Taxonomy of Interventions

This conceptualization of interventions was developed out of several prior implementation studies. The analysis and synthesis of study data resulted in the identification of "levels" of interventions. The levels convey a sense of the size, magnitude and degree of impact of interventions. The levels are hierarchical, tending to range from the more specific and concrete to the more global or general (Hall, Zigarmi & Hord, 1979; Hall & Hord, 1982).

The broadest level is that of policy, followed in descending order by game plan, game plan component, strategy, tactic, and incident (Hall & Hord, 1982). Incident interventions are small in terms of duration and the number of individuals involved. An incident is the smallest intervention unit.

> An incident is an interaction that occurs between individuals, e.g., a short interaction between the change facilitator and a teacher; or may be the delivery of a single action or event to many individuals at the same time, e.g., a memo from a change facilitator to all teachers (Hall, Zigarmi & Hord, 1979, p. 13).

This paper will focus on the analysis of incident interventions made by principals.

Anatomy of Interventions

The second intervention framework makes it possible to examine each individual incident level intervention in terms of its internal parts. With this system common properties of each intervention are coded based on seven dimensions:

- Sublevels -- degree of complexity of the action
- Sources -- person(s) who act or events that occur to influence use of the innovation
- Targets -- person(s)/process toward whom the intervention is directed
- Functions -- the purpose(s) of the intervention
- Medium -- the mode or form of action between the Source and Target
- Flow -- the direction of the action
- Location -- where the intervention takes place (Hord, Hall, & Zigarmi, 1980, p. 7).

Within each dimension, categories or "kinds" specify possible variations. For example, under sources the "kinds" would include students, individual teachers, all teachers as a group, district decision makers, etc. Each of the incident level interventions that were identified in the PTI study were analyzed and coded using this Anatomy schema (Hord & Hall, 1982).

What The Documentation Produced

The PTI data base includes 1855 incident-level interventions collected from a broad array of informants in the schools and in the districts. Of this number, the nine study principals were the source of 583. Analyses confirmed the presence of the three change facilitating styles in the intervention behaviors of the study principals and it was concluded that the three styles are real (Hall and Rutherford, 1983). Elaboration of these styles is provided in the remainder of this paper by presenting three cases to illustrate some of the ways that the principals varied by style and the dynamics of their intervening actions. Quantitative and qualitative data are included in the development of the cases.

Three Images of Implementation

Three principals within the same school district have been selected for illustration; they are typical of the three styles that were observed in the study. Their three schools experienced the same district organization, levels of resource support, district level inservice offerings, etc. The three schools were viewed by their community and the central office as being satisfactory in discharging their obligations. There were no crisis situations, extreme personnel dilemmas or enduring problems in the three schools. All principals were viewed as doing a satisfactory job and each had been the principal at their respective school for more than ten years. Yet, the principals' change facilitator styles were very different and the extent and quality of implementation varied across the schools in ways that can be directly attributed to the role and functioning of the principals and their "Second Change Facilitator."

In the PTI study a serendipitous finding was the discovery of the role of Second Change Facilitator (Hord, Hall and Stiegelbauer, 1983.) Unlike the planned-for study question about principals as change facilitators, the Second Change Facilitator (CF) emerged as a consequence of initial field work and early data collection activities. Independently each researcher "discovered" a person, in one case two persons, whom they felt were important sources of innovation-related interventions. The Second CF in some schools was the assistant principal, in some a special teacher. Some Second CFs were based in the school site; others were district-level curriculum specialists. Although the Second CF role was filled by persons at different levels and in different organizational functions across the schools, in each site a person was readily identified who had this role. Thus, interventions made by the Second CF were documented closely, using the same procedures that were being used with the study principals. The implications of this significant role will become increasingly apparent as the cases unfold.

Presentation of Quantitative Data

Selected data representing summaries of the incident level interventions of the three principals and their Second CFs are presented in Tables 1 through 4 in this section of the paper. Table 1 contains the percentages of each kind of incident intervention, i.e., isolated, simple, complex, chain, repeated (Hall & Hord, 1982), for each principal and for each Second CF. Table 2 provides percentages of the targets for the interventions. The targets range from students, teachers, school resource people and building administrators, to system level administrators and resource people, to persons beyond the system level. Table 3 presents categories of functions of the interventions by percentages. The functions are codings of the purpose of each intervention. Table 4 reports percentages of the interventions in terms of

Table 1: Sublevels of Incident Interventions
(in percentages)

	Principal As Source			Second CF As Source		
Sublevels	Responder Tyler	Manager Laurel	Initiator Abbott	Tyler's	Laurel's	Abbott's
Isolated						2
Simple	79	73	53	10	66	79
Complex	6	23	31	10	19	6
Chain	15	2	6	79	12	10
Repeated		2	8		3	2
Other			2			
Total Number (Raw Scores)	33	64	51	48	32	48

Table 2: Targets of Incident Interventions
(in percentages)

Targets	Principal As Source			Second CF as Source		
	Responder Tyler	Manager Laurel	Initiator Abbott	Tyler's	Laurel's	Abbott's
Students						
An Individual Teacher	24	2	21	6	28	27
Subset of Teachers-as Individuals	12	2	12	77	9	17
Subset of Teachers-as Groups						4
Subset of Teachers-as Whole Subse	9	5	6	4	6	25
All Teachers-as Individuals	3	9	2		6	4
All Teachers-as Subgroups		3				
All Teachers-as a Whole Group	30	23	18	2	6	8
School Site Resource People			8			6
Principal	3	6	2	6	6	2
Assistant Principal	3	27	2	2		
Innovation Facilitators		8				
District Level People	6	11	18		19	6
Other	9	5	12	2	18	
Total Number (raw score)	33	64	51	48	32	48

Table 3: Functions of Incident Interventions
(in percentages)

	Functions	Principal as Source			Second CF as Source		
		Responder Tyler	Manager Laurel	Initiator Abbott	Tyler's	Laurel's	Abbott's
1000.	Developing Supportive Organizational Arrangements	61	56	49	8	69	38
2000.	Training	3		6	8	9	2
3000.	Consultation & Reinforcement	24	20	16	44	19	25
4000.	Monitoring & Evaluating	6	22	24	40	3	36
5000.	Other	6	2	6			
Total Number (raw scores)		33	64	51	48	32	48

Table 4: Medium/Flow/Location of Incident Interventions
(in percentages)

	Principal As Source			Second CF As Source		
	Responder Tyler	Manager Laurel	Initiator Abbott	Tyler's	Laurel's	Abbott's
Medium						
Face-to-face	91	70	86	100	56	90
Written	6	19	4		19	
Audio Visual						
Telephone	3	11	8		25	
Other			2			
Flow						
One-Way	24	41	4		53	6
-Interactive	76	59	92	100	47	90
Other			4			4
Location						
School		22	12		22	23
School - Office	54	33	47	12	31	38
School - Classroom	12	3	16	35	12	35
School - Other	30	22	24	46		4
School District	3	17		4	25	
Beyond the School District		3	2	2	9	
Total Number (raw score)	33	64	51	48	32	48

the medium, the flow of the intervention and the location, where the action occurred.

The Responder: Lets It Happen

At Sunnyside School, Principal Johnson Tyler is a pleasant and generally amiable person who communicates that you are welcome in his school. He is friendly and takes time with visitors as if each person were his first priority. He finds answers to outsiders' questions, most often by asking his secretary or the assistant principal for the data needed. A visitor might also learn from Tyler about fishing in the area as well as the quail shooting prospects. His two daughters might also come into the conversation. Tyler is known as a patient listener to parents, teachers and children and is a successful mediator between parents and teachers. In the cafeteria he speaks to pupils by name. His strengths lie as a peacemaker as well as a man who can stand his ground if under fire or in a crisis. However, he appears to give little thought to anticipating crises in advance.

Principal Tyler believes in the top-down chain of command. It is known in the school that he is the boss, but he is low key and not demanding unless this premise is grossly transgressed or unless the district administration mandates a certain course. When this happens, he tells teachers what they are to do; otherwise, he lets them teach as they think best. He considers that he has a strong faculty, "They are professionals and do a fine job." He does not "push on" teachers. He stresses citizenship above all and demands polite behavior of children. He does not claim to be skilled in curriculum areas and volunteers that he delegates to others the task of monitoring curriculum implementation and helping teachers with their teaching. After delegating, he

does not typically follow-up to stay abreast of what is happening. Interactions with teachers most typically occur in his office rather than in classrooms.

He is quick to telephone area-level and central office resource people to request information that he needs at the moment. In turn, he gives them almost free rein in the school, with the trade-off that they bring him up to date about what is happening in areas that are of immediate need or interest to him. There is an openness in his relationships with the area and central office administrators and support personnel. It is significant that the Second CF for Sunnyside was an area-level curriculum coordinator. Principal Tyler did not choose her for his Second CF; she chose him.

The distribution of incident interventions for Principal Tyler and his Second CF are presented in Table 1. Note that in terms of the total number of incident interventions, the Second CF (n = 48) is more active than Tyler (n = 33). Of his activities, Tyler's largest percentage are of the simple type. The simple incident is exemplified by Principal Tyler asking the Second CF to talk with a teacher about how the teacher aides can function to help in the implementation of the new program. The Second CF, on the contrary, tends to use the more involved chain type of incidents. Chain incidents are composed of the same action repeated for a number of teachers. An example of a chain incident occurred on May 28th when the Second CF made her weekly visit to each of the five instructional aides to monitor their teaching activities.

In Table 2 Tyler most frequently targets individual teachers (24% + 12% + 3%), such as Robert Jones, a first grade teacher, who is new to the school and very frequently the target. All teachers as a whole, as the faculty in a meeting, account for another large percentage (30%) of his targets. The Second CF in Sunnyside is targeting individual teachers within subsets (77%), such as particular grade-level teachers.

What is the purpose of Tyler's incident interventions? In Table 3 it is clear that in terms of what he does, Tyler portrays the traditional "administrator" role--61% of the interventions are done for managing staff, seeking materials, information and other resources. The Second CF, meanwhile, is taking responsibility for monitoring teachers' use (40%) and providing related feedback, consultation and problem solving (44%). Tyler provides consultation without monitoring, typically initiated by teachers asking for assistance. In this case, rather than ascertaining what is occurring in the classroom and consulting with teachers, Tyler is available for consultation when teachers come to him. An example is Rosalind Hunter's discussion with him in his office about a pupil behavior problem that was occurring during learning center time.

How does the assistance to teachers occur? According to Table 4, and as illustrated by the incident just described, interventions are delivered face to face by Tyler, as opportunities present themselves. They are done interactively in a give-and-take discussion and are likely to occur in his office (54%). However, another large percentage occur in the media center (30%) where faculty meetings are held. For example, in a faculty meeting Tyler told the faculty that the district's new program must be implemented in an acceptable way. This prompted an extensive discussion, with Tyler responding to questions and concerns by telling teachers not to be discouraged, that he knew they were working at it and things would all work out in time. Only 12% of Tyler's interventions took place in classrooms.

The Manager: Helps It Happen

Wallace Laurel arrives at his school at seven a.m. each day, two hours before teachers and children arrive at nine o'clock. This early arrival makes

it possible to prepare for the day before interruptions set in, and to get the day off to a well organized and clean start. Larch Grove School reflects its principal's orderly approach. There are established procedures for obtaining supplies and materials, for handling reports, for requesting assistance, etc. In short, it is a well managed school. Teachers like their school and refer to their principal as always available, always responsive and understanding. Principal Laurel will provide or arrange assistance for his teachers; they know they can count on him to take care of their needs.

They also know that he will not unduly impose upon them. That is, he is concerned that their burden not be too heavy. He works to protect them against overload. For instance, in the data collection activities of the PTI study, teachers were asked to respond to a 10-15 minute paper pencil instrument three times during the school year. Laurel provided time for teachers to do this by giving them "his" weekly faculty meeting time, rather than intrude upon "their" time.

The school and principaling, in addition to two grandchildren, are a major focus of widower Laurel's life. He gives abundantly of his time and energy, reflected in the early start time at the school and his service on numerous district-wide policy development committees. His posture among other principals and among area and district administrators with whom he works and interacts is that of a strong colleague, but unassuming and not requiring an inequitable amount of attention or air time. In short, within the school, as well as in the external-to-the-school setting, Principal Laurel, without a lot of "fuss and feathers," sees that things get done. When he was asked to identify which of two dimensions he emphasized more in his leadership behavior, he cited "task, I'm afraid, over relationships." His reply reveals

his attention to task, but it also suggests his concern about relationship with his faculty and his wish not to exclude it in his leadership actions.

Laurel's Second CF is the assistant principal of the school, whose office is in the school's administrative complex. In working with his Second CF it is clear (Table 1) that this Manager principal does twice as much intervening (n = 64) as the Second CF does (n = 32). When interventions are examined for type, simple incidents account for nearly three-fourths or 73%, but the complex type is used one-fourth or 23% (complex incidents are a set of related simple incidents, and are therefore longer and likely to be more interactive). The Second CF has a similar distribution of simple and complex incidents, but it is noted that the Second CF did proportionately more chains (12%).

In Larch Grove School the principal met with the Second CF once a week at lunch to review all aspects of the school's activities and agenda, including program implementation. At these meetings new curriculum implementation concerns and problems were identified. Typically Principal Laurel invited brainstorming and solution suggestions from the other facilitator. A response to the problem would be identified in the meeting; who and how the solution would be carried out would be carefully outlined with each person's responsibilities detailed. Through this process the principal would become satisfied that both he and the Second CF understood who would do what.

Principal Laurel continually interacted with the Second CF and monitored his work. The Second CF accounted for 27% of the principal's intervention targets (Table 2). Many of these interventions were for planning, with the principal taking the lead. Rather than intervening on teachers directly, Laurel appears to act through the Second CF for whom nearly half of his interventions are aimed at individual teachers (28% + 9% + 6%). All teachers as a whole group accounted for another large intervention target percentage by

the principal. These interventions include those within faculty meetings or sending a memo to all teachers. Meanwhile, the principal and Second CF are targeting persons at the area and district level to request and obtain supplies, materials and training assistance for teachers. Larch Grove School and its administrators had a long-term, excellent relationship with the area-level curriculum people who provided teacher assistance.

A large proportion of the principal and Second CF's interventions are to gain materials, to schedule training, etc., which is reflected in the functions table (Table 3). Here the Manager principal, in contrast to the Responder, is assuming a larger role in monitoring teacher use of the curriculum, in concert with consultation and feedback, which also was done by the Second CF.

Table 4 indicates that the Manager principal and his Second CF provided more written interventions than were done in the other schools. Perhaps this was a procedure for communicating administrative information and other messages in a more "orderly" manner. For some reason, the Manager's Second CF was the only CF using the telephone for intervening. Unlike the other two principals the Manager principal and his Second CF have a nearly equal distribution of one-way and interactive interventions. The more frequent written interventions contribute to the higher frequency for one way.

When Principal Laurel is intervening, it is not happening in classrooms (only 3% under Location, Table 4). This Manager principal and his Second CF used a variety of locations, with most occurring in the office. For some reason they did proportionately more at the school district level (outside the school, but within the district) than the other principals. Many of these are accounted for with the telephone calls for arranging, requisitioning, and scheduling.

Unlike the other Manager style principals in the study, Wallace Laurel examined the teacher data that were collected and shared by the researchers. He noted the lack of use by most teachers of one major set of materials. He and his facilitator then planned for and implemented two major strategies that extended over the school year. Their game plan of strategies, tactics and incidents to assist the teachers in adopting the materials into classroom practice was quite effective (Huling, Hall & Hord, 1982). In this instance the Manager study principal responded to the "gap" in teachers' use of the materials with a great deal of energy and persistence--a more typical characteristic of Initiator style principals. Another example of Initiator-type behavior exhibited by Laurel was based on his concern about having sufficient "hands on, manipulative" activities and experiences for introducing new program concepts to the first graders. Thus, Laurel engaged and directed, with persistent follow-up and monitoring, the innovation facilitator to develop the needed activities. And, in addition, he directed that they be developed in collaboration with the area-level curriculum consultant.

The Initiator: Makes It Happen

Letitia Abbott opened Clear Lake School and has been its principal for more than ten years. She is well established in the school and is a highly respected principal within the district. She has very good relationships with the central office. Some would say that she is a member of the "good ole boy network," and in touch with the downtown decision makers.

Abbott is secure and confident in her position. It is clear that her first sense of responsibility and priority is for the quality of schooling offered to youngsters, and second, her obligation to teachers. Abbott is intensely businesslike in her relations with everyone in the school, even with

teachers she particularly regards well. They all perceive Principal Abbott in the same "all business" demeanor.

The principal's expectations are made clear to all, expectations for herself, for teachers, for students. Teachers tend to be strong, independent people and one person suggested that the principal deliberately selected this type of teacher. This is not a "warm fuzzy" school. The principal establishes expectations and delegates responsibilities to others. Where she stands on professional issues is stated directly. Much less is shared with the faculty about the principal as person, except for some visible signs in her office indicating that she is a bicycle racer and trains for this year round. If inquiries are made, over time one learns that Abbott has a husband but no children - such information is not volunteered.

Woven through Abbott's conversations with visitors and faculty are frequent comments about the school's programs for boys and girls, what's beneficial for students, how students will gain. The emphasis is on student outcomes and how to increase or improve them. Her consistent and total attention is on instruction, with no distractive discussion about why effective instruction can't happen because of the "changing community," "declining resources," etc. In Clear Lake School, researchers never saw a child or parent in disciplinary action with the principal, or other administrators. It must have been there, but it was not an obvious activity. What was more obvious was that the principal and assistant principal were always involved in school instructional affairs. Like the principal, the assistant principal did not stimulate social interaction with teachers. She was more typically found with teachers in professional discussions about curriculum or in hallways with pupils testing them for diagnosis of skills achievement. The administrators' true sense of responsibility and priority was instruction. In short, Abbott

ran an efficient school with consistent emphasis on instruction and benefits to students. In the quest for this, strong personal relationships, positive or negative, were of secondary importance.

The assistant principal was Principal Abbott's Second CF. Abbott had set out definite responsibilities for the assistant principal. Abbott was good at delegation and provided structure to the responsibilities and then accepted the consequences. Each of the administrators knew the domain for which they were responsible.

When Abbott became aware that teachers were experiencing problems with organizing and managing the new curriculum in their classrooms, she knew they needed more assistance in order to implement the new program smoothly. It was obvious to Abbott that teachers who were struggling to get the curriculum in place could not exercise as much instructional effectiveness. This principal did not hesitate to "push" on teachers, or others, if in so doing it would benefit students. She also believed that to push without assistance is inhumane. Abbott selected a classroom teacher, removed him from the classroom, redistributed his students among the other teachers at that grade level and made him the inhouse teacher curriculum implementation facilitator. After delegating this role, Abbott, in a carefully structured way, made expectations clear about how he should operate. Unlike the facilitators in the Manager's school, those in Clear Lake School did not do regular detailed planning. After the teacher facilitator was in the position, Abbott occasionally monitored his work. Abbott sometimes used the Second CF to monitor and find out about how the teacher facilitator was doing. Just as frequently Abbott monitored the both of them by way of teachers, using them as sources to find out "is it going okay?" Teachers reported that based on the

assistance they were given "good things are happening." It appeared to the principal that what they had set up and intended to happen was happening.

What was happening? In Clear Lake School, the Initiator principal's incident interventions (n = 51) closely totaled those of the Second CF (n = 48). There is a balance here, with both facilitators assuming responsibility for working with teachers. For this principal there is also more of a balance of simple (53%) and complex (31%) incidents. A typical simple incident was Abbott's commenting briefly to a teacher to suggest that it would be good to start the instructional period with ten minutes of drill. A complex incident, a set of related simple incidents, is exemplified by a meeting Abbott had with all the teachers to discuss instructional issues about how the program would be performed, e.g. keeping records, use of materials. The Second CF's largest percentage of incidents is of the simple type (79%), many of which were variations of popping into a teacher's classroom to see what was going on, accompanied by a word of support or advice.

Principal Abbott was targeting individual teachers (21% + 12% + 2%) for a third of her interventions. All teachers as a whole accounted for 18 percent of the targets. The district level people such as curriculum coordinators who were assigned to and visited Clear Lake School, received a like amount of Abbott's attention and interaction (18%). Abbott's Second CF was also working with individual teachers (27% + 17% + 4%) as already noted. With groups of teachers (25%), such as grade level groupings of teachers, the Second CF showed considerably more activity than the other Second CFs. It was this Second CF's custom to ask the grade level chairperson to call the teachers at that grade level together about an issue. Then in each grade level group, she would report and discuss the area of concern which she had spotted on her jaunts and popping in on classrooms. As in the Manager school, the principal

and Second CF in Clear Lake School targeted the district level resource people and decision makers with a noticeable number of interventions for planning and scheduling purposes.

The balance between the Initiator principal and the Second CF is again expressed in the functions of the incidents, Table 3. There is not an extreme difference in the percentage distribution of the two facilitators' intervention functions 1000-4000. The principal is a bit stronger on developing arrangements and the Second CF is somewhat stronger in consultation/reinforcement and monitoring/evaluation, but overall both are equally involved in each function.

The principal and Second CF are portrayed by their strong preference for face-to-face and interactive interventions (Table 4). Like the other principals, a major portion of Abbott's interventions occurred in the office. However, she has a slight edge on classroom-located interventions (16%). The Second CF performs a third of her interventions in the classroom. In this school, all except one intervention occurred within the school, quite unlike the other two schools. This school appears to look within itself to solve its problems and to allocate its own resources. Though there is no real outreach of efforts to the community, there is a school/community advisory board which makes decisions about setting priorities and how to spend discretionary funds. The principal has given the group this privilege and she sticks by their decisions, whatever they may be.

She also sticks by district decisions. Negative comments about programs or policies or district mandates are not heard from Abbott. In fact, it was not characteristic to hear anything negative from her. Perhaps this is due to her carefully developed actions for "correcting" policies that were not useful to her school. An illustration of this came out of the issue of reteaching

pupils who had not achieved the curriculum objectives of a prior grade level. Concern and discussion developed across the school and across the area group of schools about the district policy. In Clear Lake School the issue was recognized by Abbott, data were collected in Clear Lake classrooms and analyzed, and a determination was made about how to resolve the policy with the district. Abbott met with the district policy people, presented her data-based case, they gave approval and the policy was changed for Clear Lake School.

The Images: Contrasts

These case descriptions summarize many of the distinguishing patterns that were observed in all study schools. These appear to be characteristic intervention patterns for particular change facilitating styles. The relationship to the Second CF is also a style characteristic. Some additional detail of these similarities and differences follow.

Number and type of Interventions. In the total number of incidents, Table 1, made by the principals and Second CFs there was an increase from the number in the Responder led school (Principal Tyler 33 + Second CF 48 = 81) to the Manager led school (Principal Laurel 64 + Second CF 32 = 96) to the Initiator led school (Principal Abbott 51 + Second CF 48 = 99). In terms of the distribution between the principal and the Second CF's interventions, the Initiator principal and her Second CF had nearly equal numbers. The Manager style principal did twice as many interventions as his Second CF. A third pattern was the Responder principal doing less interventions than his Second CF who did 50% more than the principal.

In looking at the simplicity/complexity of the incidents, there was a decrease in percentage of simple incidents from Responder to Manager to

Initiator principals. When examining the more than simple interventions (complex + chain + repeated), there was an increase in the more "rich" interventions from Responder (6% complex + 15% chain) to Manager (23% complex + 2% chain + 2% repeated) to Initiator (31% complex + 6% chain + 8% repeated) principals.

Targets. In terms of targets (Table 2), all teachers as a whole group were targeted in increasing percentages from the Initiator to Manager to Responder principals. The Initiator and Responder targeted individual teachers in approximately the same proportion, while the Manager did not work with individuals, but operated through his Second CF by targeting interventions on him. Unlike the other two schools, there was a noticeable lack of interventions targeted on district level people by the Responder principal and his Second CF.

Functions. There was an increase in the proportion of interventions with developing arrangements functions (Table 3) in the order of Initiator to Manager to Responder. The same increase was found in the consultation/reinforcement function. The reverse was true of the monitoring/evaluating function.

Medium/flow/location. The Manager used a higher percentage of written and telephone interventions, the most notable differences in medium (Table 4). Also, the manager had a more even distribution of one-way and interactive flow, whereas, both Initiator and Responder used interactive flow more often. The Responder did a higher percentage of interventions in the office than Initiator than Manager. The Initiator was intervening in classrooms more, followed by Responder and Manager respectively. Except for one incident beyond the school system setting, the Initiator school incidents all occurred within the school.

Location of Second CF. In the Initiator's school and in the Manager's school, the Second CFs were drawn by the principals from the human resource pool at the school. This pattern was also found in the other study schools. Also true was the case that in all Responder led study schools the Second CF came from outside the school, from the area level or central office. Initiators and Managers, if there was not already a person identified in the Second CF's role or if the role didn't exist, selected a person or restructured staff and created the role and identified personnel to fill it. If grooming was needed, the principal provided it. For the Responder schools, the role and person was created and supplied by a force outside the school.

In Summary

What difference did these facilitators make? Three styles of working with teachers in implementing curriculum have been portrayed. The three styles have been useful in characterizing the nine principals in the PTI study and the nineteen principals observed in the earlier studies. Within the groups of Initiators, Managers, and Responders there is, of course, variation. But, the three classifications are distinctive. Distinguishing the Responder from the other two styles seems to be an easy task. Their concern for feelings and letting others take the lead are clear. The Initiator and Manager style frequently become blurred when considering some particular aspects of the style. Managers appear to exhibit Initiator behavior at times. However, their overall emphasis and intervention patterns are quite different, and these differences were consistently observed in the PTI study.

These differences go beyond intervention beha ior. They can be related to aspects of school life. For example, in a procedure developed by the researchers, implementation success was compared across all classrooms, across

all sites and across multiple innovations. An important and telling statistic resulted: the correlation between implementation success and principals' change facilitating style, as perceived and rated by researchers, was .74, which is statistically significant at the .01 level (Huling, Hall, Hord, Rutherford, 1983). This finding indicates that the more that principals functioned as Initiators, the higher the implementation success at the classroom level. The image of the principal is reflected in teacher's classroom practice.

In conclusion, the results of the Principal Teacher Interaction Study are a strong testimonial to the impact that principals can have. Most certainly, the principals described in this paper made a difference, some more than others. It is clear that the images of these principals are cast upon their schools.

REFERENCES

Corbett, H. D. Principals' contributions to maintaining change. Phi Delta Kappan. November 1982, 63(3), 190-192.

Cotton, K., & Savard, W. G. The principal as instructional leader. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980.

Fege, A. Recovering from the cult of innovation: Reflections on change and improvement. School Administrator, 1980, 37(6).

Fullan, M. The meaning of educational change, New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1982.

Goldstein, M. L., & Rutherford, W. L. Methods for documenting interventions: Strengths of a hybrid multi-informant approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. A framework for analyzing what change facilitators do: The intervention taxonomy. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1982.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., & Griffin, T. H. Research on the concerns-based adoption project. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1980.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. Program Definition and Adaptation: Implications for Inservice. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1981, 14(2), 46-58.

Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. L., Newlove, B. W. Levels of Use of the Innovation: A Framework for Analyzing Innovation Adoption. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 29(1), 52-56.

Hall, G. E. & Rutherford, W. L. Concerns of Teachers About Implementing Team Teaching. Educational Leadership, 1976, 34(3), 227-233.

Hall, G. E., & Rutherford, W. L. Three change facilitator styles: How principals affect improvement efforts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L. and Griffin, T. H. Three change facilitator styles: Some indicators and a proposed framework. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982.

Hall, G. E., Zigarmi, P., & Hord, S. M. A taxonomy of intervention: The prototype and initial testing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Hord, S. M. Analyzing administrator intervention behaviors. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

Hord, S. M., & Hall, G. E. Procedures for quantitative analysis of change facilitator interventions. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1982.

Hord, S. M., Hall, G. E., & Stiegelbauer, S. M. Principals don't do it alone: The role of the consigliere. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Hord, S. M., Hall, G. E., & Zigarmi, P. Anatomy of incident and tactic interventions: Dimensions, design. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

Huling, L., Hall, G. & Hord, S. Effects of principal interventions on teachers during the change process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March, 1982.

Huling, L. L., Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M. & Rutherford, W. L. A multi-dimensional approach for assessing implementation success. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Leithwood, K. A., et al. An empirical investigation of teacher's curriculum decision-making processes and strategies used by curriculum decision managers to influence such decision making. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. The role of the elementary schools principal in program improvement: A review. In press.

Lipham, J. M. Effective principal, effective school. Reston, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1981.

Little, J. School success and staff development in urban segregated schools. Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education, Boulder, Colorado, Center for Action Research, 1981.

Persell, C. H., & Cookson, P. W., Jr. The effective principal in action. The effective principal: A research summary, Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982, 22-29.

Reinhard, D. L., Arends, R. A., Kutz, W., Lovell, K., & Wyant, S. Great expectations: The principal's role and inservice needs in supporting change projects. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

Rutherford, W. L. The intervention and plans principals make when facilitating change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research association, Dallas, 1981.

Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L., & Hall, G. E. Change facilitators: In search of understanding their role. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1983.

Rutter, M., Ouston, J., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Smith, A. Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Venezky, R., & Winfield, L. Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching reading. Newark: University of Delaware, 1979.